



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,676	04/18/2007	Keiji Take	2611-0251PUS1	8280
2292	7590	07/16/2009	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				GU, YU
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/16/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/562,676	TAKE, KEIJIRO	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	YU (Andy) GU	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 24,26,28-31,33-39 and 41-46 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 24, 26, 28-31, 33-39 and 41-46 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Status of Claims***

1. Applicant's amendment, filed on 5/12/2009, has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 24, 26, 28-31, 33-39 and 41-46 have been amended. Claims 1-23, 25, 27, 32 and 40 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 24, 26, 28-31, 33-39 and 41-46 are pending.
2. In light of Applicant's amendment, rejections of claim 33-35 and 41-43 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite are withdrawn.
3. The examiner has withdrawn the objection to specification.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. **Claims 24, 26, 28 and 36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) anticipated by US 6292667 B1 Wallentin et al. (hereinafter Wallentin).

Regarding **claim 24** (currently amended), Wallentin *discloses a paging control method*

- *executed by a paging control apparatus (i.e. the RNC (s), see at least Figure 1 and 2 item 22 and the Abstract) in a mobile network including*
  - *a core network (see at least Figure 1 and 2 e.g. items above dash-line 20),*
  - *a radio access network (see at least Figure 1 and 2 e.g. items below dash-line 20),*

- *and a mobile communication terminal (see at least Figure 1 and 2 and the Abstract),*
- *wherein the radio access network includes a plurality of base stations (i.e. BS<sub>x,y</sub> as shown in Figure 1 and 2), and a radio network controller (i.e. RNC1 as shown in Figure 1 and 2) serving as the paging control apparatus, the paging control apparatus including at least two controllers (e.g. RNC1 and RNC2, see at least Figure 1B) among which controlling of communication between the core network and the base stations is functionally distributed, one of the at least two controllers (see at least Figure 3A item 244) being a first controller (e.g. RNC1 ) processing a paging message transmitted from the core network to the radio access network (see at least Figure 3A and column 7 lines 27-46), and wherein the mobile communication terminal performs communication with at last one of the base station via a radio interface (see at least column 3 lines 16-18),*
- *the paging control method comprising:*
  - *receiving at the first controller (e.g. RNC1) the paging message (e.g. the paging message received at event 5-1) transmitted from the core network to the radio access network (see at least column 10 lines 58-67);*
  - *judging at the first controller (e.g. RNC1) a transmission destination of the paging message by:*

- determining whether a signal connection exists between the mobile communication terminal and the radio access network or the core network (see at least column 11 lines 26-56, where Wallentin discloses checking paging table 100 to determine the transmission destination, thereby judging whether a signal connection between RNC1 and the mobile exists, e.g. when destination is RNC2 e.g., signal connection does not exist between RNC1 and the mobile),
- when the signal connection exists, judging the transmission destination to be one of the at least two controllers (e.g. RNC 1) that controls the signal connection (see at least column 11 lines 26-40),
- and when the signal connection does not exist, judging the transmission destination to be one of the at least two controllers (e.g. RNC2 which controls a predetermined bases station) that controls a predetermined base station of the base stations or one of the base stations that is identified from the paging message (see at least column 11 lines 42-56);
  - and transmitting from the first controller the paging message to the transmission destination (see at least column 11 lines 66-67).

Regarding **claim 26** (currently amended), Wallentin discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim **24**. Wallentin further discloses:

- *wherein the paging message is transmitted by multicast transmission* (see at least column 11 lines 39-42, where Wallentin discloses transmitting paging message to the base stations for the cells belonging to a multicell area, therefore transmitting to multiple base stations, thus a multicast transmission).

**Claims 28 and 36** (currently amended) contains similar limitations as that of claim 24 which are rejected on the same ground (s) as addressed in the in rejection of claim 24.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. **Claims 29-31, 33-35, 37-39 and 41-46** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallentin in view of US 6792278 B1 Ahmavaara et al (hereinafter Ahmavaara).

Regarding **claim 29** (currently amended), Wallentin discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim **28**. Wallentin does not expressly disclose the limitations of claim 28. However, in a related field of endeavor, Ahmavaara discloses:

- *a connection information registering unit* (i.e. the paging database, see at least Ahmavaara column 2 lines 19-25, column 5 lines 1-5) *configured to register signal connection information including a first indication of whether a first connection* (e.g. under the first IMSI) *between the mobile communication terminal and the radio access network exists, a second indication* (e.g. under the second IMSI) *of whether a second connection between the mobile communication*

*terminal and the core network exists (see at least Ahmavaara column 1 lines 49-53, column 2 lines 14-29),*

- *and a specified controller (i.e. RNC) configured to control the first connection or the second connection, wherein the first controller refers to the signal connection information to judge the transmission destination to the specified controller* (see at least Ahmavaara column 4 lines 48-53),

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Wallentin in view of Ahmavaara in order to efficiently enable multiple signal connections as discussed by Wallentin (see at least Ahmavaara column 2 lines 36-67).

Regarding **claim 30** (currently amended), Wallentin as modified by Ahmavaara discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim **28** and **29**. Wallentin is silent as to the limitations of **claim 30**. However, in a related field of endeavor, Ahmavaara discloses *signal connection information includes:*

- *first connection information including*
  - *the first connection, a first identifier* (i.e. IMSI1, which is associated with the mobile communication terminal, and the association is temporarily stored in the paging database, see at least Ahmavaara column 2 lines 36-40) *that temporarily identifies the mobile communication terminal,*
  - *and the specified controller* (i.e. RNC) *configured to control the first connection* (see at least Ahmavaara column 4 lines 48-53),

- *and second connection information that associates the first identifier with a second identifier (i.e. IMSI2) having a number form peculiar to the mobile communication terminal,*
- *if the mobile communication terminal sets the second connection(e.g. whether IMSI2 has arrive in an “old” node), and upon receiving a paging message including the second identifier (e.g. IMSI2), the first controller refers to the signal connection information to judge the transmission destination (see at least Ahmavaara column 5 lines 5-15 and 23-36).*

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Wallentin in view of Ahmavaara in order to efficiently enable multiple signal connections as discussed by Wallentin (see at least Ahmavaara column 2 lines 36-67).

Regarding **claim 31**(currently amended), Wallentin and Ahmavaara disclose the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim **28, 29** and **30**. Wallentin is silent as to the limitations of claim 31, and Ahmavaara does not expressly disclose that a third identifier, and consequently is silent as to the limitations of claim 31. Ahmavaara however does discloses that a mobile station may have several IMSI for multiple connections (see at least Ahmavaara column 1 lines 44-53), and therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a third IMSI (which contains information related to the operator's network as one of ordinary skill knows, thus peculiar to the core network), and to page the mobile terminal in the manner disclosed by Ahmavaara and Wallentin in order to support 3 connections.

Regard **claim 33** (currently amended), Wallentin as modified by Ahmavaara discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim **28** and **29**. Wallentin further discloses:

- *wherein when the transmission destination is judged to include multiple controllers or base stations, (see at least column 7 lines 48-67), the first controller copies the paging message, and transmits copied paging message to all the controllers and all the base stations (see at last Figure 5 item 5-3 through 5-6 and corresponding text).*

Regard **claim 34** (currently amended), Wallentin as modified by Ahmavaara discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim **28** and **29**. Wallentin further discloses:

- *wherein the paging message is transmitted by multicast transmission (see at least column 7 lines 48-67, and Figure 5 item 5-3 through 5-6 and column 11 lines 39-56, where Wallentin discloses transmitting paging message to the base stations for the cells belonging to a multicell area, therefore transmitting to multiple base stations, thus a multicast transmission).*

Regard **claim 35** (currently amended), Wallentin as modified by Ahmavaara discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim **28** and **29**. Wallentin further discloses:

- *the one of the at least two controllers judged as the transmission destination includes the controller further includes:*
  - *a second controller (i.e. RNC2) that controls a base station within a call area of the mobile communication terminal decided by the core network* (see at least column 11 lines 39-56),

- *and a third controller (e.g. one of the plurality of RNCs that are involved in the paging message as identified in event 5-4) that controls data transfer to the base station controlled by the second controller (see at least column 1143-50),*
- *upon receiving the paging message from the core network, the first controller transmits the paging message to the second controller or the third controller using a multicast address the second controller or the third controller associated with the call area, the multicast address having been registered in advance(i.e. cell areas which are grouped in advance as shown in Table 1, see at least column 7 lines 48-67) registered in advance (see at least column 7 lines 48-67, and Figure 5 item 5-3 through 5-6 and column 11 lines 39-56, where Wallentin discloses transmitting paging message to other RNCs e.g. RNC2 for cells controlled under RNC2, therefore transmission is addressed to multiple base stations, thus a multicast address).*

**Claims 37** (currently amended) contains similar limitations as that of claim 29 which are rejected on the same ground (s) as addressed in the in rejection of claim 29.

**Claims 38** (currently amended) contains similar limitations as that of claim 30 which are rejected on the same ground (s) as addressed in the in rejection of claim 30.

**Claims 39** (currently amended) contains similar limitations as that of claim 31 which are rejected on the same ground (s) as addressed in the in rejection of claim 31.

**Claims 41** (currently amended) contains similar limitations as that of claim 33 which are rejected on the same ground (s) as addressed in the in rejection of claim 33.

**Claims 42** (currently amended) contains similar limitations as that of claim 34 which are rejected on the same ground (s) as addressed in the in rejection of claim 34.

**Claims 43** (currently amended) contains similar limitations as that of claim 35 which are rejected on the same ground (s) as addressed in the in rejection of claim 35.

Regard **claim 44** (currently amended), Wallentin and Ahmavaara disclose the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim **36, 37 and 43**. Wallentin further discloses:

- *wherein the multicast address* (i.e. see at least column 7 lines 46-67, as shown in Table 1, there's a list of other RNCs e.g. RNC2 associated with RNC1) *of the third controller* (i.e. see at least Figure 3B item 248) *associated with the second controller* (i.e. RNCs e.g. RNC2 as shown in Table 1, see at least column 7 lines 48-67) *is registered in advance, and upon receiving the paging message from the first controller, the second controller transmits the paging message to the third controller using the multicast address* (see at least column 7 lines 48-67, and Figure 5 item 5-3 through 5-6 and column 11 lines 39-56, where Wallentin discloses transmitting paging message to other RNCs e.g. RNC2 for cells controlled under RNC2, therefore transmission is addressed to multiple base stations, thus a multicast address).

Regard **claim 45** (currently amended), Wallentin and Ahmavaara disclose the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim **36, 37, 43 and 44**. Wallentin further discloses:

- *wherein a multicast address including all base stations controlled by the third controller (one of the plurality of other RNCs identified in event 5-4) is registered in advance, and upon receiving the paging message from the second controller, the third controller transmits the paging message to all base stations controlled by the third controller using the multicast address (see at least column 7 lines 48-67, and Figure 5 item 5-3 through 5-6 and column 11 lines 39-56, where Wallentin discloses transmitting paging message to the base stations for the cells belonging to a multicell area, therefore the transmission is addressed to multiple base stations, thus a multicast address).*

Regard **claim 46** (currently amended), Wallentin and Ahmavaara disclose the limitations as shown in the rejection of claim **36, 37** and **43**. Wallentin further discloses:

- *wherein a multicast address including all base stations controlled (see at least column 9 lines 1-15, i.e. list of cells in a MCA controlled by RNC2) by the third controllers is registered in advance, and upon receiving the paging message from the second controller, the third controller transmits the paging message to all base stations controlled by the third controller using the multicast address (see at least column 7 lines 48-67, and Figure 5 item 5-3 through 5-6 and column 11 lines 39-56, where Wallentin discloses transmitting paging message to the base stations for the cells belonging to a multicell area, therefore the transmission is addressed to multiple base stations, thus a multicast address).*

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YU (Andy) GU whose telephone number is (571)270-7233. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester G. Kincaid can be reached on 5712727922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/YU (Andy) GU/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Lester Kincaid/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617